

# HOUSE BILL REPORT

## HB 3188

---

**As Reported by House Committee On:**  
Natural Resources, Ecology & Parks

**Title:** An act relating to the transfer of jurisdiction over conversion-related forest practices to local governments.

**Brief Description:** Transferring jurisdiction over conversion-related forest practices to local governments.

**Sponsors:** Representatives B. Sullivan, Hinkle, Dunshee and Buck.

**Brief History:**

**Committee Activity:**

Natural Resources, Ecology & Parks: 1/31/06, 2/2/06 [DPS].

### Brief Summary of Substitute Bill

- Removes the current December 31, 2005, deadline for the adoption of ordinances by local governments for approvals of Class IV forest practices.
- Requires certain local governments to adopt ordinances that allows the authority to approve or disapprove forest practices to transfer from the Department of Natural Resources to the local government by January 1, 2008.

---

### HOUSE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, ECOLOGY & PARKS

**Majority Report:** The substitute bill be substituted therefor and the substitute bill do pass. Signed by 9 members: Representatives B. Sullivan, Chair; Upthegrove, Vice Chair; Buck, Ranking Minority Member; Blake, Chandler, Dickerson, Eickmeyer, Hunt and Kagi.

**Minority Report:** Do not pass. Signed by 2 members: Representatives Kretz, Assistant Ranking Minority Member and Orcutt.

**Staff:** Jason Callahan (786-7117).

#### **Background:**

##### Classes of forest practices

Prior to conducting a harvest, or most other silvicultural treatments on forest land, a forest landowner must apply to the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) for approval of the proposed forest practice. The application process and application fee required varies

depending on which class of forest practice is proposed. A forest practice can fall into one of four classes:

- **Class I forest practices** have a minimal direct potential for damaging a public resource. Most Class I practices do not require pre-approval by the DNR.
- **Class II forest practices** have a less than ordinary potential for damaging a public resource. Class II practices require notification to be given to the DNR, but do not require a formal approval.
- **Class III forest practices** are silvicultural treatments that do not fit into the definition of the other classes of forest practices. They have a higher potential to damage a public resource than Class II practices, but a lesser potential than Class IV practices. Class III forest practices do require pre-approval from the DNR.
- **Class IV forest practices** have a potential for substantial impact on the environment. This includes harvesting within an urban growth area and harvesting in an area that is likely to be developed into a non-forestry use. Class IV practices require pre-approval by the DNR in some cases and by local governments in other cases.

#### The role of local governments in forest practices approvals

Counties and cities have the authority to approve or disapprove certain Class IV forest practices applications. In order to assume approval authority, the county or city must adopt ordinances that establish minimum standards for Class IV forest practices, establish the necessary administrative provisions, and set procedures for the collection of fees. All cities and counties were required to adopt the necessary ordinances for Class IV forest practices approval by December 31, 2005.

The authority to approve or disapprove Class IV forest practices applications does not pass from the DNR to the city or county until the DNR has granted final approval of the city's or county's ordinances. In conducting a review of the local government's proposed ordinances, the DNR is required to consult with the Department of Ecology (DOE), and may disapprove the ordinance wholly or in part. Local governments that believe a disapproval of their ordinances was improper may appeal the DNR's decision to the Forest Practices Appeal Board.

Counties and cities that adopted the necessary ordinances to obtain control over Class IV forest practices approvals and had those ordinances approved by the DNR, were eligible for technical assistance from the DNR until January 1, 2006.

---

#### **Summary of Substitute Bill:**

The process for transferring authority to approve or disapprove forest practices applications is repealed. A new mechanism with new dates is established. Some counties and cities are required to adopt forest practices approval ordinances by the end of 2007, while the other counties and cities retain the discretion to not assume the responsibility for approving forest practices. The requirements on local governments vary depending on whether a county plans

under the Growth Management Act (GMA), although the path for transferring jurisdiction remains constant across all counties.

#### Mandatory vs. discretionary

Some counties and cities are required to adopt and enforce ordinances or regulations for the approval of forest practices applications, while the assumption of this responsibility is optional for other local governments. The trigger for determining if a county or city is required to adopt these ordinances is the number of forest practices applications that have been submitted within the county for the time period between January 1, 2002, and December 31, 2004, and whether the county plans under the GMA.

For counties planning under the GMA, if more than 25 Class IV applications had been filed to the DNR between those dates for properties within a specific county, then that county, and the cities within it, are required to adopt forest practices approval ordinances. If the number is less than 25, or if the county does not plan under the GMA, then the transfer of jurisdiction for approvals is optional for the county and its cities.

In determining the number of Class IV applications filed within a county, only certain applications are counted. Those counted are limited to applications for Class IV practices on lands platted in 1960 or later, lands that have been converted to a non-forestry use, lands that will not be replanted because of a likelihood of conversion to a non-forestry use, and lands within an urban growth area.

#### GMA counties vs. non-GMA counties

The requirements for counties differ depending on a particular county's participation under the GMA.

Counties not planning under the GMA, and the cities within them, are given the discretionary authority to assume the jurisdiction for approving Class IV forest practices on lands platted in 1960 or later, lands that are not to be reforested because of the likelihood of future urban development, and lands that are already in the process of being converted to a non-forestry use.

Counties that do plan under the GMA, and their cities, are required to adopt ordinances covering Class IV forest practices applications on the same lands that non-GMA counties must address, as well as ordinances for the approval of all four class types of forest practices when those applications are submitted for land located within an urban growth area.

The only land that GMA-planning counties and cities are not required to assume the jurisdiction over are ownerships of 20 contiguous acres or more. However, the 20-acre exception only applies if the owner of the property submits a written statement to the county and the DNR that he or she does not intend to convert the property to a non-forestry use for the coming decade. The owner's written statement must be accompanied by both a written forest management plan that is acceptable to the DNR, and documentation that the land is enrolled, for the purposes of property taxes, as forest land of long-term significance.

### Prerequisites for a transfer of jurisdiction

The ordinances adopted by the counties and cities must require appropriate approvals for all phases of forest land conversion and procedures for the collection of all administrative and permit fees. Development regulations must also be adopted that protect public resources from material damage and require appropriate approvals for all phases of forest land conversion. The local jurisdiction must also ensure consistency between its comprehensive plan and the new development regulations.

### Role of the DNR

Exclusive jurisdiction over forest practices approvals remains with the DNR until a county or city satisfies all requirements for the jurisdictional transfer, even after the date by which all counties must have the appropriate ordinances adopted. The ordinances adopted by the local government must be approved by the DNR before the transfer of jurisdiction can occur. The DNR is also required to provide technical assistance to the cities and counties during and after the process of ordinance adoption.

### **Substitute Bill Compared to Original Bill:**

The original bill did not require the DNR's approval of local ordinances before the authority to approve Class IV forest practices was transferred.

---

**Appropriation:** None.

**Fiscal Note:** Available.

**Effective Date of Substitute Bill:** The bill takes effect 90 days after adjournment of session in which bill is passed.

**Testimony For:** (In support of original bill) This bill provides technical corrections to how land is converted in counties planning under the GMA and streamlines local government's ability to assume some forest practices regulation. The city and county level is the appropriate level for land use regulations to be initiated and maintained. The local governments are in the process of adopting regulations for conversion, but they lack the expertise and resources. Having the DNR approve local ordinances is an important step in the process. If the investment is going to be made by the local governments, the state should not maintain a redundant permitting system that requires landowners to follow a confusing path between various jurisdictions in order to convert forest land into a non-forestry use. The bill will give forest landowners who wish to convert their property one-stop regulatory shopping without forcing landowners who wish to continue practicing forestry to deal with an agency other than the DNR.

(With concerns on original bill) Not all counties wish to take on the additional burdens brought on by having to regulate forest practices. This is especially true for counties not planning under the GMA.

**Testimony Against:** None.

**Persons Testifying:** (In support of original bill) Eric Johnson, Washington State Association of Counties; Stephen Bernath, Department of Ecology; Leonard Young, Department of Natural Resources; and Jeff Rasmussen, Cowlitz County.

(With concerns on original bill) Miguel Perez-Gibson, Audubon Society.

**Persons Signed In To Testify But Not Testifying:** None.